



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,075	08/06/2001	Lynn Henry Wheeler	34250-1174	1892
29052 7590 03/11/2009 SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP 999 PEACHTREE STREET, N.E. ATLANTA, GA 30309				
EXAMINER PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J				
ART UNIT 2437		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 03/11/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/923,075

Applicant(s)

WHEELER ET AL.

Examiner

MICHAEL PYZOCHA

Art Unit

2437

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date: 9/24/09

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-39 are pending. Claims 1-11 have been withdrawn from consideration.
2. Amendment filed 02/18/2009 has been received and considered.

Specification

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The specification fails to provide support for the newly added limitation. See the rejection under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 put forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 12-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims recite that a verification status is generated "as a function of whether data associated with a verification status has been output from the device within a predefined period of time" however the specification

provides no support for data associated with the verification status being output. The specification only discloses outputting the verification status based on the predetermined time period.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 12, 14-17, 21, 23-26, and 30-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer (US 5422953) in view of McClain et al. (US 6049874) and further in view of Kanevsky et al. (US 5774525).

As per claims 12, 21, 38 and 39, Fischer discloses a method and system for providing a random number for utilization in a computer program application that requires the random number, the method comprising the steps of: creating a private key of a public/private key pair within a secure device (see figure 2 numeral 24 and column 3 lines 44-46; column 4 lines 29-41; and column 7 lines 56-59); comparing pre-stored verification data to input verification data received from a user of the secure device (see column 7 lines 51-62); upon receipt of message data at the secure device originating a digital signature for the message data, the originating comprising (see column 7 lines 43-50): calculating a hash value for the message data; encrypting the hash value using the private key (see column 7 lines 51-62); providing the results of the encrypting step

as a generated digital signature (see column 7 lines 51-62) providing to the computer program application external to the device the generated digital signature constitutes a random number for use by the computer program application (see 7 lines 63-67).

Fischer fails to explicitly disclose the use of a digital signature as a random number for secure electronic communications and fails to disclose creating a verification status indicator, based on a comparison of verification information that is a component of the digital signature and as a function of whether data associated with a verification status has been output from the device within a predefined period of time.

However, McClain et al. teaches using a digital signature as a random number for secure electronic communications (see column 12 lines 28-57) and Kanevsky et al. teaches generating an authentication status (i.e. verification status indicator) based on a comparison of input data and pre-stored data where the indicator does not include the pre-stored or input data as a message (see Kanevsky et al. column 8 line 49 though column 9 line 7) as a function of whether data associated with a verification status has been output from the device within a predefined period of time (see column 7 lines 11-32).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the digital signatures of Fischer as a random number for secure electronic communications and for the message of Fischer to include an authentication result thereby making the authentication result a component of the digital signature.

Motivation to do so would have been to provide a unique session specific session key for encryption (see McClain et al. column 12 lines 28-29) and to control access to

the system and sub-systems (see Kanevsky et al. column 8 line 49 through column 9 line 41).

As per claims 14 and 23, the modified Fischer, McClain et al. and Kanevsky et al. system discloses using the generated digital signature to generate a session key for secure electronic communications (see McClain et al. column 12 lines 28-57).

As per claims 15 and 24, the modified Fischer, McClain et al. and Kanevsky et al. system discloses the digital signature is generated within a computer chip within the device (see Fischer figure 1 and column 3 lines 25-38).

As per claims 16 and 25, the modified Fischer, McClain et al. and Kanevsky et al. system discloses the computer chip itself includes a random number generator (see Fischer figure 1 numeral 10 and column 4 lines 1-15).

As per claims 17 and 26, the modified Fischer, McClain et al. and Kanevsky et al. system discloses the digital signature is generated within the computer ship using the private key and a random number obtained from the random number generator (see Fischer column 4 lines 1-15).

As per claims 30 and 34, the modified Fischer, McClain et al. and Kanevsky et al. system discloses the computer program application is a security protocol (see McClain et al. column 12 lines 28-57).

As per claims 31, 32, 35, and 36, the modified Fischer, McClain et al. and Kanevsky et al. system fails to explicitly disclose the security protocol is SSL and PGP.

However, Official Notice is taken that at the time of the invention one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize to use the random numbers of the modified Fischer,

McClain et al. and Yasukura system in SSL and PGP. Motivation to do so is that these are two well-known security protocols that use random numbers.

As per claims 33 and 37, the modified Fischer, McClain et al. and Kanevsky et al. system discloses the computer program application is a digital signature algorithm for generating a digital signature (see Fischer column 7 lines 51-62).

8. Claims 13 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Fischer, McClain et al. and Kanevsky et al. system as applied to claims 12 and 21 above, in view of Binding et al. (US 6775772).

As per claims 13 and 22, the modified Fischer, McClain et al. and Kanevsky et al. system fails to disclose the use of the digital signature to distinguish and prevent a replay attack.

However, Binding et al. teaches the use of a digital signature on a nonce to distinguish and prevent a replay attack (see column 9 line 64 through column 10 line 11).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the digital signature as a safeguard against a replay attack.

Motivation to do so would have been to verify the identity of each party in the communication.

9. Claims 18 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Fischer, McClain et al. and Kanevsky et al. system as applied to claims 17 and 26 above, and further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter AAPA).

As per claims 18 and 27, the modified Fischer, McClain et al. and Kanevsky et al. system discloses the use of other digital signature algorithms (see Fischer column 3 lines 56-60) but fails to explicitly disclose the use of an elliptical curve digital signature algorithm.

However, AAPA teaches that an elliptical curve digital signature algorithm is a common way to generate a digital signature (see paragraph 146 [page 26 line 32-36]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use an elliptical curve digital signature algorithm because doing so is a common way of generating a digital signature.

10. Claims 19, 20, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Fischer, McClain et al. and Kanevsky et al. system in view of AAPA as applied to claim 18 and 27 above, and further in view of Wang (US 6594759).

As per claims 19, 20, 28 and 29, the modified Fischer, McClain et al. and Kanevsky et al. system in view of AAPA discloses the chip being tamper resistant (see Fischer column 3 lines 31-38), but fails to explicitly disclose the random number generator is inaccessible from outside the computer chip.

However, Wang teaches that the random number generator can be used solely by a computer chip (see column 13 line 49 through column 14 line 6).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to make the random number generator of the modified Fischer, McClain et al., Yasukura and AAPA system be inaccessible from the outside.

Motivation to do so would have been to increase the security of the system.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 02/18/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that none of the cited references disclose generating a verification status as a function of whether data associated with a verification status has been output from the device within a predefined period of time.

With respect to Applicant's argument that none of the cited references disclose generating a verification status as a function of whether data associated with a verification status has been output from the device within a predefined period of time, Kanevsky teaches storing history data of the questions asked (i.e. data associated with the verification status) and varying these questions based on the time which therefore generates a verification status based upon a predetermined time.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Stoltz and Wood teach re-authenticating a user after a predetermined period of time.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PYZOSKA whose telephone number is (571)272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2437

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. P./

Examiner, Art Unit 2437

/Emmanuel L. Moise/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437